



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

IX. — *Studies in Greek Agonistic Inscriptions.*

BY PROF. EDWARD CAPPS,

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

IN connection with a study, undertaken some time ago, of the later history of the dramatic contests in Athens, I found it necessary to extend the range of my observations and collections to cover the records of the dramatic and musical exhibitions of the Greek world at large, and to direct my attention somewhat particularly to the individual performers who participated in them. These records are preserved largely in inscriptions, the texts of which are often difficult to decipher and mutilated. Some attention had to be paid to their restoration, often where only the name of an individual performer was involved. In this way I have come into the possession of some material of a more or less miscellaneous character, a part of which I shall attempt to put together in this paper in as compact a form as the varied nature of the several items will permit. Many of the facts or suggestions which will be presented may seem to be, in themselves, too trivial to record; but, after all, no apology is needed for the intrinsic unimportance of any contribution, however slight, to the history of the post-classical drama in Greece, or of the other public exhibitions which played so large a part in the intellectual, religious, and social life of the people.

Of the numerous agonistic inscriptions found in various parts of Greece, none will compare in importance, after those of Athens itself, either for intrinsic interest or for the light which they throw upon the conditions of dramatic and musical exhibitions in the third century B.C., with the series of ten catalogues of performers at the Apollonia and Dionysia at Delos, and the similar but much more extensive catalogues pertaining to the Soteria at Delphi. The larger questions arising out of these inscriptions have been very fully treated

by various scholars, and will therefore receive only incidental attention here. But a number of minor matters, relating both to the constitution of the text and to the identity and functions of individual performers, have not received sufficient consideration, especially in the case of the Delian inscriptions. Fortunately the dates of all the members of each series have been at last definitively settled, so that, with due caution, the names of the performers in them may be used to assist in establishing the period of activity of *τεχνῖται* mentioned in literature and in undated inscriptions of a similar nature. We shall consider first the Delian catalogues.

The Choregic Inscriptions of Delos.

The French excavations at Delos brought to light in 1881 a number of inscriptions which are perhaps best classed as choregic. The first division in each contains the names of the choregi for the year, first for the chorus of girls at the Apollonia, then for the *χοροὶ παίδων, τραγῳδοί,* and *κωμῳδοί* at the Dionysia. Then follow, as a rule, the names of the performers (not the victors alone) in the lyric, dramatic, musical, and other exhibitions, all embraced under the general heading: *οἷδε ἐπεδείξαντο* (once *ἠγωνίσαντο*) *τῷ θεῷ*. A list of articles, belonging to the treasure of the god, which the archon of the year handed over to his successor, is sometimes added at the end, sometimes inserted before the catalogue of performers. The name of the archon in whose year the exhibition was given precedes the list of choregi, thus furnishing the date of each record by the assistance of the chronological table of Delian archons established mainly by Homolle. The first nine inscriptions were first published by Hauvette-Besnault in the *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, VII. (1883), p. 103 ff., the tenth by Paris, *ibid.* IX. (1885), p. 146 ff. The whole series has been republished and ably discussed by Brinck, "Inscriptiones Graecae ad choregiam pertinentes," *Diss. Halen.* VI. (1886), pp. 187 ff.¹ In the original publica-

¹ Michel, *Recueil d'Inscriptions Grecques*, Nos. 902-904, reproduces the complete records for the years 286, 284, and 270. I do not know on what grounds he gives the dates two years later in each case. That for the year 284 is found in

tions facsimiles were unfortunately not given, and the copies in majuscules which Hauvette-Besnault furnishes have been shown to contain a number of inaccuracies,¹ many of them doubtless due to the engravers. Paris gives only a transcription in small letters of the catalogue for the year 172 B.C., remarking that the letters A, E, and Θ, as often in Delian inscriptions, are engraved as Λ, Γ, and Ο—a fact that accounts for a number of the errors to which attention will be called.

The text of the portions of these inscriptions which contain the lists of the participants in the Delian exhibitions—with which alone we are at present concerned—follows. I give the readings of the first editors throughout, except where certain corrections have been made by others.

I. 286 B.C., τραγωιδοί· Θεόδωρος Μεγαρεύς, | Φιλοκλείδης Χαλκιδεύς. | κωμωιδοί· Τελέστης Ἀθηναῖος, | Σαννίων δῖς, Δεξίλαος, | Διόδωρος Ἀθηναῖος, Διόδωρος Σινωπεύς. | αὐληταί· Καφίσιας Θηβαῖος. | κιθαρωιδοί· Μένων Ἀθηναῖος, | Ξενοκράτης Ἀμβρακιώτης, Φιλόδαμος. | [ψ]άλτης· Διομήδης Μηθυναῖος. | κιθαριστής· Ἐπικράτης Ἀργεῖος, Ἐλληνοκράτης. | ραψωιδοί· Ἀρχέλας Θετταλός, | Γλαῦκος Ἀθηναῖος.

II. 284 B.C., αὐλητής· Ξενοφάντος Θη[β]αῖος. | κωμωιδοί· Φαῖδρος Ἀθηναῖος, Κηφίσιος Ἰστιαιεύς. | κιθαριστής· Ἦρις Καλχηδόνιος. τραγωιδοί· | Εὐδωρος Μεγαρεύς, Θεμιστων² Πάριος, | Νικόστρατος Κασσανδρεύς.

III. 282 B.C., αὐληταί· | Τιμόστρατος Κυζικηνός, Διο
· | κωμωιδοί· Τέλεσις Πάριος, | Ἱερώνυμος, Πολυκλῆς, Μενεκλῆς, | Σιμίας Ἀθηναῖος, Διόδωρος Σινωπεύς. | τραγωιδοί· Θεμιστων . σα , | Διονύσιος, Ἀρίσταρχος, Ἡγήσιππος. | κιθαριστής· Λύσανδρος, Δρ , | Αὐτόνομος ΞΟ . . ΑΙ - - - | Φιλήμων, Νικόστρατος, Ἀμεινίας.

IV. 280 B.C., τραγωιδοί· | Νικόλαος Ἡπειρώτης, Δράκων³ Ταραντίνος, | Ἀκέσιος Ῥόδιος, Κλεόδωρος. | κωμωιδοί· Τελέων Μεγαρεύς, Σιμίας

the second edition of Dittenberger's *Sylloge*, No. 692. I have not had access to Von Schoeffer, *De Deli insulae rebus*.

¹ Besides those which will be noted in the lists of performers I may mention, in justification of textual corrections which I shall propose: ANTIGENHΡAIZ-KOΣ for ANTIFEN(HΣ)HP(A)IZKOΣ, Ditt., p. 519, n. 5; Π]AIZΩN for KΩM]ΩN(I)AIZΩN and ΞENΩN for (ΠAIZ)ΩN, Brinck, pp. 200 and 203.

² So Wilhelm in Michel, *Recueil*, Add. et Corr. p. 949, for Hauvette-Besnault's reading Θε . . . τωνος Πάριος.

³ So Homolle, *B.C.H.* XIV. (1890), p. 502, n. 2, for H.-B.'s Ἀσαράκων. The correct form of the name appears in the accounts of the *λεποιοί*.

Ἀθηναῖος, | Κηφίσιος Ἔστιαίς, Ἀριστοφάνης Σολεύς. | αὐλητής ·
Τιμόστρατος Κυζικηνός. | κιθαριδός · Κλέων Σικυνώνιος, Ἀθηναῖος, | Εὐ-
άνθης Μηθυμναῖος.

V. 270 B.C., κιθαριδοί · Αἰνησίδημος, Μνησίθεος. αὐληταί · | Θεόδω-
ρος, Νεοπτόλεμος. τραγω[ῖδοι] · | Θεόδωρος, Διονυσόδωρος, Εὐκλῆς, |
Οἰκιάδης. κωμικοί · Ἐργόφιλος Ἰέρωνος, | Χόρηγ[ος],¹ Κ[ά]λλιπ(π)ος,
Κλεόξενο[s]. | θαυματοποιός ·² Κλευπάτρα.

VI. 265 B.C., αὐλητής · Ἀντιγενείδας. | κιθαριδοί · Μεγιστοκλῆς,
Ἀνδρέας Τεγεάτης. | κιθαριστής · Ἀντιφάνης. | κωμικοί · Ἐργόφιλος,
Φανύλος, Παρίων, Ἐρέτιμος, | Φιλωνίδης, αρχος Ἀρκάς. | κωμι-
δοποιός · Νικόμαχος Ἀθηναῖος. | τραγικὸς · Θεόδωρος. | θαυματοποιός ·
Κλεοπάτρα.

VII. 261 B.C., [κ]ωμικοί · Πο[λ]ύκριτος Κασσ[ανδρεύς], Μενε-
κράτης | ος Σίφνιος, - - - - | ης Κείος, ος
Ἱεροκλέ | [ους] Ἀθηναῖος, Πολυνε[ίκης] ου Χαλκιδεύ[ς]. τραγω-
δοί · Σωτίων Ἀκαρν[άν], Ἡ[λ]ις Παραμόνο[υ] δεύς. κιθαριδοί ·
Ἀριστόμαχος, | Εὐθύμαχος Εὐθυμάχου Κνίδιος. | αὐληταί · Ὀν[ή]σιππος
- - - | [θα]υματοποιός · Σέρδων Ῥωμαῖος, Ἀρίστιον. | [κωμ]ικοδοποιός ·
Χρύσιππος.

VIII. 203 B.C., κωμικὸς · Εὐδη | μος τρίς. κιθαριστής · Αἴνετος δῖς.

IX. 173 B.C., ΜΩΙΚΑΙΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ - - - - | Λ . . . ΘΛ . ΣΥΝ
- - - | ΛΠΛ . . . ΛΡΛΙ - - - - | . . . ΛΡΙΞ - - - - | ΝΑΤΙΛΗΞ . Π
. . . Λ - - - - | ΙΞΤΗΞΑΝΤΙΠΤΑΤ⁴ - - - - .

X. 172 B.C., [αὐλ]ητής · Περιγένης | ἐνίκα μετὰ χοροῦ, Καλλιμέλ[ης] . .
. . ο[δο]του, Νικάνδρος. | τραγικοί · Μενέδημος, Εὐκράτης, Ἄντ[ι]λοχος,
Εὐ | ων, Φίλων, Αὐτοκράτης, Ἀγασίστ[ρατος] . κι[θαρι]σταί · |
Κριτόξενος, Ἱεροκλῆς, μετὰ χοροῦ Σ[τρά]των, Ἐ[ρμ]ῶναξ. κιθαριδοί ·
Διονύσιος, Θράσων,⁵ Δημήτριος. κ[ωμ]ικοί · Θαρσύνων, Ἡρόστρατος,
Π[ολυ]ξένος, Λυ . . | δος, Ἀθηνηκῶν. θαυματοποιοί · . . . χ.ος, Ζώϊλος |
δῖς, Ἀρτεμῶ δῖς, Ἀπολλω[νί]ας δῖς. ὀρχηστής · Σωσῶ δῖς. νευρο-
σπα(σ)ταί⁶ · - - - - | σίων. ῥωμαιστής · Ἀγαθόδωρος.

It is to be noted, first of all, that there seems to be no consistency in the use of the father's name and the ethnicon

¹ So Brinck, p. 197, for χορηγ . . . , which H.-B. took for a caption.

² H.-B. read δλυματοποιός. Dragoumis, *B.C.H.* vii. (1885), p. 384 f., made the correction.

³ Brinck, p. 204, suggests [κωμ]ι(δο)ι — rightly, as we shall see.

⁴ *Id.* [κιθαρι]στής Ἀντίπατ[ρος].

⁵ Wilhelm, *Jahresheft d. oesterreich. arch. Inst.* III. (1900), p. 49, for Paris' reading Θράκων. Below Paris reported Νεῦρος, Παρ . . . , . . . σίων, Ῥωμαιστής (a proper name); Wilhelm corrected as above.

in these lists. Of the total of about 130 names, 68 appear without the ethnicon, while, according to the editor, only one has the father's name alone and only six both the father's name and ethnicon. There is, however, a far greater degree of consistency in the individual lists than these figures would indicate; for example, we observe that in VIII and X the simple name alone is given, and in III (15 out of 19) and in VI (10 out of 13) the same rule is followed in the large majority of instances, while in II and in V the ethnicon is used in all but one case; the addition of the father's name to the ethnicon is confined to VII, the father's name without the ethnicon being recorded only once, in V. No one who is familiar with Greek inscriptions will demand entire uniformity in such matters, yet so striking a divergence in the practice of the same community in preparing official documents leads one to examine carefully the texts, in the first instance, and then to seek to discover some underlying principle of usage. Brinck (l.c. p. 200) has already noted the fact that in the choregic portions of these inscriptions the father's name is never omitted after the names of citizens, as opposed to metoeci, who served as choregi. Kirchner, in the Pauly-Wissowa *Encyclopädie*, seems to have assumed that the same rule holds good also of the performers without ethnica.¹ I myself once supposed that such persons were likely to be Athenians,² seeing that the use of the ethnicon in at least one instance (No. I, the *κωμῳδοί*, *Διδώρος Ἀθηναῖος* and *Δ. Σινωπεύς*) was apparently to be explained by the necessity of distinguishing an Athenian from a homonym of another country. But this conclusion was rash, for in this very list only four out of the sixteen names are without the ethnicon.

An examination of the lists reveals two facts which render the assumption of Kirchner untenable. In the first place the same persons in different years have at one time the ethnicon and again not; e.g. the *τραγῳδοί*, *Θεμιστῶν Πάριος*

¹ See for example s.v. Aristarchus (10). He generally, however, designates such persons as "Delier" with a query, e.g. s.v. Ameinias, Athenaios, Antiphon, etc.

² *Am. Jour. Arch.* IV. (1900), p. 81.

in II, is simply *Θεμίστων* in III, unless indeed the letters .σα . . . which follow in Hauvette-Besnault's copy are the remains of the ethnicon. But they point rather to *Δ(ρ)άκων*, which Homolle restored in IV for H.-B.'s *'Ασαράκων*.¹ If then *Δράκων* is to be restored here as well as in IV, we have two undesignated persons who are neither Delians nor Athenians, for Homolle has shown that *Δράκων* is no other than the *τραγωδός*, *Δ. Ταραντίνος*, who figures in the accounts of the *ἱεροποιοί*—evidently the *Δράκων Λύκωνος Ταραντίνος* who is found in the Soteric catalogue for 271 B.C. (Baunack, 2564, 50). Again the *τραγωδός*, *Θεόδωρος Μεγαρεύς*, of I and II is probably the same person who appears in V and VI as simply *Θεόδωρος*. See Brinck, p. 193. In the second place, some of the *τεχνῖται* who are found without ethnica here are found with ethnica in contemporary records of other festivals. To be sure, the identification of such persons is not so certain as in the case of those whose country is given,² but where there is agreement in three points, viz. name, occupation, and date, there can be no reasonable doubt that the country is also the same.

Thus the following persons can be supplied with their proper ethnica: The comic actor³ *Κ[ά]λλιπ(π)ος* in V is the *Κάλλιππος Καλλίου Σουνιεύς* who was victorious at the Lenaea at Athens in 306 B.C., *C.I.A.* II. 1289, credited with four Lenaeian victories in *C.I.A.* II. 977 uv; *Κλεόξενος*,

¹ *B.C.H.* XIV. (1890), p. 502, n. 2. A. Körte, who makes the identification with the Soteric performer, *N. Jahrb. f. d. klass. Alterth.* III. (1900), p. 86, reports him incorrectly as comic didascalus—a mistake that is often made in the Pauly-Wissowa *Encyclopädie* in referring to persons mentioned in the Soteric inscriptions.

² The identification by Reisch, *De mus. certam.* p. 96 ff., of two *τραγωδοί* of the Soteric inscriptions with *τραγωδοί* of the Delian, viz. *Τελέστης Θεοκλείδου 'Αθηναῖος* with *Τελέστης 'Αθηναῖος* in I and *Σωτίων*, father of *'Αριστοκράτης Σωτίωνος 'Ακαρνάν* with *Σ. 'Ακαρνάν* in VII, contributed largely to the final establishment of the correct dating of the Soteric inscriptions, which had formerly been assigned to the second century.

³ I consider *κωμῳδός* and *τραγωδός* as entirely equivalent to *ὑποκριτὴς κωμικός* and *τραγικός*, in spite of the arguments to the contrary which Mr. Herbert Richards, *Classical Review*, xiv. (1900), p. 201 ff., has adduced. I hope to produce on another occasion the evidence in defence of the accepted view.

a κωμῳδός in V, is the Κλεόξενος Ἀχαίου Χαλκιδεύς, comic actor in the Soteric list for 272 B.C.; Φιλωνίδης, a κωμῳδός in VI, is the Φιλωνίδης Ἀριστομάχου Ζακύνθιος, comic actor at Delphi in the same year, and priest of the guild of τεχνῖται for the four years; 272-269. He is credited with both Lenaeon and City victories at Athens in *C.I.A.* II. 977 uv and f'w. In VII, under the comic actors, Hauvette-Besnault gives Μενεκράτης ος Σίφνιος. Between the name and the ethnicon we must supply either a genitive or a nominative, and perhaps the context, which seems to give several instances of the tripartite name, would favor the former supposition. But when we find in the Soteric catalogue for 272 B.C. a comic didascalus Μενεκράτης Ποτειδαίου Μεγαρεύς, the presumption is all in favor of the simple name in the Delian list. (So Brinck.) The Menecrates of the Delian inscription might almost equally well be the father of Σίμακος Μενεκράτου Ἀργεῖος, a comic actor at Delphi in 271 B.C.

We shall find later on that several other persons of the Delos lists are to be identified with performers at the Soteria whose ethnica are given. But enough evidence has been offered to prove that the omission of the ethnicon in the Delian lists is of no significance as regards the country of the individual. No principle has been followed in this matter. We should not be far wrong if, on the contrary, we were to assume that none of these τεχνῖται were Delians, but that all were imported for the festivals. We know of no dramatic or musical artists who were Delians; at least I do not recall having come upon one either in literature or in the inscriptions. The important thing in this regard is that we should not forget the fundamental fact concerning all musical and dramatic exhibitions of this period, at least outside of Athens, namely, that the personnel at any particular festival bore no direct and necessary connection with the locality in which the festival was held, but that the choice of the performers rested entirely with the κοινὸν τῶν περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον τεχνιτῶν which had been commissioned by the locality to furnish forth the various kinds of entertainments specified in

the contract. In selecting the persons who should take part in an exhibition, the guild would be likely to send out those of its members who were citizens of the place in question. Thus it is that we find so many Boeotians in the Soteric lists, although the exhibition was in charge of the Athenian synodos at this time.¹ The large number of names common to the agonistic inscriptions of Delphi, Athens,² and Delos of the first half of the third century proves that the Athenian synodos had charge also of the Delian exhibitions under consideration.

I have already shown that one of the six instances of the use of both the father's name and ethnicon (Menecrates) is due to a false reading. One other is certainly to be set aside on the same ground. In VII, Hauvette-Besnault gives $\xi\Omega\tau\iota\omega\text{ΝΑΚΑΡΝ} \dots \lambda\iota\Xi\text{ΠΑΡΑΜΟΝΟ}[\dots\dots]\Delta\text{ΕΥΞ}$, and reads $\Sigma\omega\tau\iota\omega\text{ν 'Ακαρν[άν, 'Ηλ\iota\varsigma Παρ\alpha\mu\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon]δ\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma}$. Brinck follows the first editor's evident intention, and restores the genitive $\text{Παρ\alpha\mu\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon}[\upsilon]$. But, in the first place, 'Ηλ\iota\varsigma is an unheard-of name, found neither in the Pape-Benseler *Eigen-namen* nor in the Fick-Bechtel *Personennamen*, though the latter cites 'Ηλ\iota\varsigma , a Kosename from $\text{'Ηλ\iota\delta\omicron\delta\omega\rho\omicron\varsigma}$ or the like, in one instance from the Euxine. In the second place, it is to be remarked that this reading gives only two $\text{πραγ\omega\delta\omicron\iota}$ for the year, although in other respects the exhibition of 261 B.C. was above the average in the number of performers. The remedy is simple: read $\Sigma\omega\tau\iota\omega\text{ν 'Ακαρν[άν] (δ)\iota\varsigma, Παρ\alpha\mu\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon}[\varsigma \text{Χαλκ\iota}]δ\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$. In the list for the same year, instead of the editor's reading - - - $\text{ος 'Ιεροκλ\epsilon[ους] 'Αθ\eta\text{ν}\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma}$, we might equally well restore - - - $\text{ος, 'Ιεροκλ\epsilon[ίδης] 'Αθ\eta\text{ν}\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma}$, but the next name, $\text{Πολυνε[ίκης] - - -]ου}$, and below, $\text{Εὐθύμαχος Εὐθυμάχου}$, must stand, if the copy is correct. In V, however, $\text{'Εργόφ\iota\lambda\omicron\varsigma, 'Ιέρων(υ\mu)\omicron\varsigma}$ would be a plausible correction of $\text{'Εργόφ\iota\lambda\omicron\varsigma 'Ιέρωνος}$ —a style of name that does not occur elsewhere in these inscriptions. The simple name $\text{'Εργόφ\iota\lambda\omicron\varsigma}$

¹ As shown by Sauppe, *Commentatio de collegio artificum scaenicorum atticorum*, p. 10 ff.

² As regards the comic actors, the only class of performers well represented in Athenian inscriptions, see my article in *Am. Jour. Arch.* III. (1900), pp. 82-3.

occurs in VI. Hieronymus appears as a comic actor also in III, and is well known as the victor at the Lenaea at Athens in the year 290¹ (*C.I.A.* II. 972), and is credited with a total of four Lenaean victories in *C.I.A.* II. 977 uv.

The published text admits of a few other corrections and restorations. I would suggest in III ὀρ[χιστής] for Δρ - - - as the category under which Αὐτόνομος falls. An argument in favor of this is the fact that the singular καθαριστής is given as the heading of the preceding category. It used to be thought that in the Soteric inscriptions the singular and plural were employed carelessly in the headings, but in every supposed instance an explanation is to be found.² The same is true of at least most of the errors of this kind that have been attributed to the engraver of the Delian inscriptions. Wilhelm has removed one in X by a clever and altogether convincing correction. In I and VII the plural is used before a single name, but in I there is room in the line for a second name, and in VII a vacant space is left for the missing name. There is ground for suspicion in I and IV that the text is either imperfect or imperfectly understood.³ It is certainly no objection to the restoration of ὀρχιστής in III that no other performance of this kind is found in these records before the year 172 B.C. Professional dancers

¹ That this is the correct date, and not 354 as reported in the Corpus, see *Am. Jour. Arch.* III. (1900), p. 74 ff.

² Baunack's text has removed one instance; the others are due either to the misplacement of the heading, as Lüders and Baunack have shown, or to omissions corrected at the end of the catalogues by the engraver himself. See p. 127 of this article.

³ I. καθαριστής · Ἐπικράτης Ἀργεῖος, Ἑλληνοκράτης. The last word looks more like an epithet, especially appropriate to the musical artist. Compare Pindar, *Nem.* 10, 25, referring to Theaeus the wrestler: ἐκράτησε δὲ καὶ ποθ' Ἑλλανα στρατὸν (Fick). As a proper name it is rare, confined apparently to Thessalians; cf. Bechtel in Collitz' *Sammlung*, No. 345, 72, Ἑλληνοκράτης Ἀγαθοῦνιος, and Aristotle, *Politics*, V. 1311 b, 17, Ἑλ. ὁ Λαρισαῖος. These are the only instances that I have found. The spelling in our inscription is not Thessalian.

IV. καθαρωδὸς · Κλέων Σικυνῶνιος, Ἀθήναιος. The rule followed in the list for this year is to add the ethnicon for each person. I suspect that Ἀθηναῖος was intended—the ethnicon of a person whose name, along with the name of the category to which he and the next-mentioned person belonged, was omitted by the stone-cutter by mistake.

were popular at Athens in the fourth century (cf. Aristotle, *Poetics*, ch. I). An ὀρχηστής belonged to the corps of τεχνῖται who formed the Dionysiac guild at Ptolemais in Egypt toward the middle of the third century (*B.C.H.* IX. p. 123 ff.). In these Delian lists the ψάλτης and the βαψφοδοί appear only once.

Among the κιθαρφοδοί in X, Paris has Θράκων, for which Wilhelm proposes to read Θράσων, doubtless because the former is not a good Hellenic name. Wilhelm's conjecture is certainly right; in fact, this citharode is already known to us from an interesting inscription from Delphi copied by Colin and published by Homolle in *B.C.H.* XX. (1896), p. 295 (Baunack 2800). It is a proxeny decree, of which the preamble runs as follows: ἐπειδὴ Θράσων καὶ Σωκράτης Πάτρωνος Αἰγυρᾶται παραγενόμενοι ποθ' ἅμ' ἐπιδείξεις ἐποίησαντο τῷ θεῷ, διὰ τῶν λυρικῶν συστημάτων προφερόμενοι τῶν ἀρχαίων ποιητῶν, . . . δεδόχθαι κτέ. A lyre is engraved on the margin of the stone, "emblème de la profession des personnages honorés" (Colin). The text and the emblem make it sufficiently clear that the brothers Thrason and Socrates were citharodes. The date of the decree is given as ca. 165 B.C., which accords well with the date of the appearance of the citharode Thrason at Delos (172 B.C.). The further suggestion of Wilhelm that we read below λυ[ρωι]δός for Λυ . . . δος, which Paris regarded as a proper name, is open to the serious objections that λυρῳδός is unexampled, I believe, in agonistic inscriptions as the title of a performer on the lyre, and that, if it were used, it would be equivalent to κιθαρῳδός, as the Delphian decree just quoted shows. The suggestion is undoubtedly in the right direction, however. Now the heading κιθαρφοδοί has already been given in our inscription; we should therefore read αὐ[λωι]δοί, which is epigraphically as easy as Wilhelm's suggestion in view of the fact, reported by Paris, that A is regularly written without the bar in this document. The aulode is not found before on these lists, but is not uncommon in other agonistic inscriptions. ῥωμαίστης as the designation of a performer is certainly strange, but distinctly preferable to considering it as

a proper name, with the first editor. It is probable that the same word stood in the corresponding place of the very fragmentary record of the preceding year, where Brinck restored [κιθαρ]ιστής. The citharists were mentioned two lines above. We recognize in l. 9 the name of Θα[ρ]σύν[ων], who is one of the κωμφοδοί in X, thus confirming Brinck's conjecture of [κω]μωι(δο)ί for Hauvette-Besnault's -μωικαί. The portion of IX which had to do with the performers then probably stood somewhat as follows :

7. [καὶ οἶδε ἡγωνίσαντο τῷ θεῷ· κω-]
 8. μωι(δο)ί· Θεόδωρος, [Ἡρόστρ]
 9. α[τος], Θα[ρ]σύν[ων. τραγωιδί·]
 10. ΑΠΛ . [κιθ]αρ(ω)ιδοί·]
 11. [κιθ]αρισ[ταί·]
 12. ΝΑΤΙΑΗΞ . Π . . . Λ [ῥωμα-]
 13. ιστής· Ἀντίπατ[ρος].

The comic actor Theodorus may be identical with Θεόδωρος κωμφοδός of the Iasus inscription of ca. 170 B.C. — Le Bas-Waddington, *Insc. d'Asie Mineure*, No. 256 (Brinck, p. 227). I have supplied Ἡρόστρατος provisionally, one of the comic actors associated with Tharsynon in X.

In the next to the last line of III, Hauvette-Besnault gives "Αὐτόνομος (espace vide), (nom effacé)." Of this "lost name" he records ΞΟ . . ΑΙ, followed by space for about eight letters. Brinck, p. 195, rightly asserts that we must assume here, not a proper name, but rather "novum artificum genus." The vacant space preceding would indicate this. He suggests κιθαρωιδοί or ῥαψωιδοί, although he admits that the letters which the editor reports would not favor either restoration. A clew to the correct reading is furnished by the three names, the performers in the class indicated. It chanced that these same names appear in close juxtaposition in the list of comic poets victorious at the Lenaea at Athens, *C.I.A.* II. 977 g. A rough calculation, based on the position of these names relative to the name of Menander, which precedes, gives the last decade of the third century as about the time of the first victories of Nicostratus

and Ameinias, *i.e.* some twenty years before the Delian festival at which these three persons appeared. Although the elder Philemon won his first Athenian victory in 327 B.C., he was active until ca. 262 B.C. So far, then, as the date is concerned, there is no reason why these comic poets should not have presented their plays at Delos in the year 284 B.C. Now, as has been said, Sauppe has shown that the exhibitions at Delphi in this period were in charge of the Athenian guild of Dionysiac artists. We have found many persons at Delos who participated also in the Delphic festival. The Athenian guild undoubtedly bore even a closer relation to the Delian festivals than to the Delphic. It can therefore hardly be a mere coincidence that three artists of a certain class at Athens should be found together in the same class at Delos, and that at about the same date. There is little room for doubt that the Delian artists were comic poets. Comic poets are found in the Delian lists for the years 265 and 261, designated as *κωμωιδοποιοί*. This title should be restored here, or the equivalent (π)ο[ητ]αὶ [*κωμωιδιῶν*]. It must be acknowledged that the letters seen by the first editor do not favor the one nor the other, but the state of the stone is doubtless responsible for this. A reëxamination of the stone, I feel confident, would establish this and many of the restorations which seem to go against the palaeographical evidence.

In addition to those mentioned heretofore, it may be worth while to enumerate the other persons in the Delian lists who are also found in the Athenian and Delphic catalogues. The comic actor Cephisius in II and IV acted in a play of Diodorus, *C.I.A.* II. 972; Polycles and Meneclès, comic actors in III, are in the list of victorious actors, *C.I.A.* II. 977 uv and f'w. Polyxenus in X is probably the victor in the comic contest of ca. 170 *C.I.A.* II. 975 e (. ενος ἐνί[κα.]). In the Delian lists for 286 and 270 we find the *κιθαρωδοί*, *Φιλόδαμος* and *Αἰνησιδῆμος*. The names recall the Delphic inscription in honor of *Φιλόδαμος Αἰνησιδάμου Σκαρφεύς* and his brother, which was added as a subscript to the famous Paean to Dionysus found in 1895 (Weil, *B.C.H.* XIX. (1895),

p. 410 ff. ; Baunack, 2742). The brothers were in some way connected with the paean ; probably executed it, as Weil conjectures. Baunack gives the date as 340-300, probably 325-300.¹ Since a citharode would most naturally be called upon to perform a paean and the Philodamus, son of Aenesidamus of Scarpheia, belonged to a family of musicians, it seems extremely probable that the Delian citharodes, Philodamus and Aenesidamus, belonged at least to the same family. Indeed, a date somewhat nearer 300 for the Delphic inscription would permit the identification of Philodamus, and Aenesidamus, citharode in 270, would be his son, bearing his grandfather's name. The aulete Διο - - - in III may be the aulete Διόφ[αν]το[ς] Χίος in the Soteric list for 272 B.C. One is tempted to suspect that the name of the comic actor 'Ερέτιμος in V (270 B.C.) is a false reading for 'Επίτιμος. The former name, which does not occur elsewhere (Fick-Bechtel, p. 68), would have to be explained as = 'Επίτιμος ('Επι- for 'Αρι-), whereas in the Soteric catalogue for 272 is found a comic actor, 'Επίτιμος Ἀμβρακιώτης. Here again the stone alone will decide.

The Soteric Inscriptions of Delphi.

The four inscriptions pertaining to the dramatic and musical exhibitions at the Soteria at Delphi, first deciphered and published by Wescher and Foucart, *Inscriptions recueillies à Delphes*, Nos. 3-6, have recently been inspected and reëdited by Baunack in Collitz' *Sammlung d. gr. Dialekt-Inschriften*, II. 6, Nos. 2563-66. After the labors of Foucart,² Lüders,³ Reisch,⁴ Baunack, and other scholars, little remains to be done for the improvement of the text or in interpretation. In a few matters of detail, however, I hope to be able to offer

¹ The Delphic archon of the inscription, Etymondas, was a *ραποιδός* for some years before 325 and was certainly not archon until after that date — Baunack thinks soon after. So far as I can judge there is nothing against the supposition that he was archon nearer the lower limit set by Baunack.

² *De collegiis scenicarum artificum apud Graecos*, p. 61 ff.

³ *Die Dionysischen Künstler*, p. 112 ff.

⁴ *De musicis Graecorum certaminibus*, p. 87 ff.

a better restoration of the text, and there is one point in interpretation to which I desire to call attention.

The Soteric inscriptions, like the Delian, give the names of all guild-members who performed at the exhibitions, but the programme from year to year was more constant, the performers more numerous, and the lists prepared with greater care. The Athenian guild of *τεχνῖται*, which provided the artists, did not depend upon the local community, as it seems to have done in the case of the Delian festival, to furnish the members of the choruses, the costumes, etc., but sent to Delphi three sets of choral performers and from one to three costumers. The date of each catalogue has at last been definitively established, viz. 272 to 269 B.C.¹ They are thus contemporary with the first seven Delian lists which we have discussed.

The Delian catalogues assist us in restoring two names in the Soteric inscriptions. In Baunack, 2563, 32, we find . . . *κιάδης Νικάνδρου Κασσανδ[ρε]ύς*, a tragic actor. The father's name naturally led Foucart to restore *Νε[κ]ιάδης*, which subsequent editors have adopted. But in the Delian list for 270 B.C. one of the *πραγῳδοί* is *Οἰκιάδης*. We should therefore read *[Οἰ]κιάδης*. In l. 31 of the same inscription the stone gives, as one of the *διδάσκαλοι αὐλητῶν*, . . . *ήσιππος [Δ]ιώνος Βοιώτιος*. Wescher and Foucart restored *[Ὀν]ήσιππος*. But Baunack rejects this on the ground that the lacuna calls for three, not two, letters, and proposes *[Αἰν]ήσιππος* or something similar. Now one of the *αὐληταί* at Delos in 261 B.C. was *Ὀνήσιππος*, confirming the restoration of the French editors. The extra space before this name to which Baunack calls attention was filled by the —, which is regularly employed in the Soteric inscriptions as a mark of punctuation to separate names written on the same line. These two cases may be regarded as certain. In a third passage

¹ These dates were reached by Pomtow, *Jahrbuch f. klass. Philologie*, XLIII. (1897), p. 819 ff. I had not yet seen this important article when I used these inscriptions in the article previously cited, in which I followed the approximate dating first established by Reisch, ca. 270–250. Until Reisch they were believed to belong to the second century.

the proposal of Wescher and Foucart can be set aside, though the true reading cannot be supplied with certainty. In 2563, 59 one of the comic actors is . . . κ[λ]ῆς Διοκλέους Ἀθηναῖος. The French editors suggested [Διο]κλῆς, which does not quite fit the space.¹ No comic actor of this name is found elsewhere, but there are three other names, any one of which would suitably fill the space: Πολυκλῆς and Μενεκλῆς, both κωμῳδοί at Delos in 282 B.C., and Φιλοκλῆς, in the Athenian catalogue of victors, *C.I.A.* II. 977 uv and f'w. Since we know the country of none of these persons, we cannot decide on their respective claims.

Not a few names recur in the Soteric catalogues twice or oftener. In the large majority of instances of this kind the performer remains in the same class, *i.e.* the κωμῳδός always recurs as κωμῳδός, the αὐλητής as αὐλητής, etc. As in the classical period each branch of the dramatic or the musical profession was kept apart from the others by sharp lines of division,² even in the case of branches so closely allied as tragic and comic acting, so in the period which we have under consideration it would seem that these distinctions were still more sharply drawn and in some branches grades were established which had not formerly existed. Thus in the roll of members of the Dionysiac guild at Ptolemais (*B.C.H.* IX. (1885), p. 132), each kind of performance has its own distinct representatives, and there is also the special flute-player for tragedy and a second grade of tragic actors, συναγωνισταὶ τραγικοί. Aristotle's statement³ that the same persons might at one time constitute a tragic, at another time a comic, chorus is not really at variance with this rule, for, considered professionally, the work of the choreutes was essentially the same in both. Nor are we surprised to find an individual rising from a lower to a higher grade in a given branch, as, for example, when Θύρσος Κρίτωνος Ἐφέσιος, a

¹ It is besides the name of a tragic actor in 2566, 55 — an objection which Lüders saw, *op. cit.* p. 141.

² Plato, *Resp.* 3, 395 a: οὐδὲ μὴν βαψφοδοὶ γε καὶ ὑποκριταὶ ἅμα· οὐδέ τοι ὑποκριταὶ κωμῳδοῖς τε καὶ τραγῳδοῖς οἱ αὐτοί. Lüders, *op. cit.* p. 141.

³ *Politics*, 3, 1276 b.

χορευτῆς κωμικός in 271 B.C. (2564, 78), appears two years later (2566, 64) as a comic διδάσκαλος. It is also quite in the natural order of things that Ὀνήσιππος, a διδάσκαλος αὐλητῶν at Delphi in 272 (2563, 31), is simply an αὐλητῆς at Delos ten years later. It is certainly somewhat surprising, however, to find Κηφισόδωρος Καλλίου Βοιώτιος, who was a comic διδάσκαλος in 272 and 271 (2563, 65; 2564, 56), only a χορευτῆς κωμικός in 269 (2566, 76), although we can conceive that there may have been some special reason for the change in duties.¹ There remains, however, in the Soteric inscriptions, one apparent departure from the principle, of so striking a character that our suspicions are aroused: Nikon, the costumer in 2564, 80, is a comic actor in 2565, 65. This seems to me distinctly incredible, and the following suggestion may be advanced by way of explanation. Among the ἱματιομίσθαι for 272 is a Νίκων Μενεκλέους Σολεύς. The comic actor is Νίκων Ἡρακλείτου Ἡπειρώτης. In the intervening year we may assume that, while the same Nikon of Soli served again as costumer, the person who prepared the list for the stone-cutter carelessly put down the father and country of the other Nikon, a member of the same guild. Other examples of this kind of error, traceable to the author of the lists and not of a palaeographical nature, are found in these inscriptions.²

Serious errors of omission and of false arrangement, committed by the engraver, have been pointed out by Lüders³ and Baunack. Thus in 2563 after l. 51 the διδάσκαλος, and in 2566 after ll. 67 and 70, both the διδάσκαλος and the

¹ A similar instance is possibly Διογείτων [] Βοιώτιος, comic διδάσκαλος in 2563, 66, and Δ. Εὐαρχίδου Βοιώτιος, χορευτῆς κωμικός in 2564, 74 and 2565, 75, if Baunack is right in identifying the two persons. But Diogeiton is a very common name in Boeotia. Compare also the χορευτῆς ἀνὴρ, Δεξιτικός [] Σικυνῶνιος in 2564, 42 and the ποιητῆς προσοδίου, Δ. Παντοίου Σικυνῶνιος. In both cases a strong presumption is raised against the identification by the difference in function.

² So should be explained Γνωτέας Γλαύκου Τενέδιος in 2565, 34, but Γ. Γ. Κνίδιος in 2566, 29, and Ἐπικρατίνος Νικομήδου Ἀργεῖος in 2565, 24, but in 2566, 22, Ἐπικράτης N. A. The omission of names or of fathers' names, a space being left on the stone, is a similar kind of error.

³ *Op. cit.* p. 114 f.

αὐλητής for a group of comic actors have been omitted. Sometimes the heading for a particular category has been put a line too high or too low, leaving too few performers under one head and too many under the next. In one case I think that the true explanation of an apparently similar confusion in the text has not yet been seen. In 2564 Baunack observes that we have only thirteen *παῖδες χορευταί*, instead of the usual fifteen. But three *αὐληταί* precede, instead of two, the necessary number for two choruses. Baunack proposes here the solution which elsewhere seems most satisfactory: that we should assume that the engraver placed the caption *χοροὶ παίδων* one line too low. This gives fourteen choreutae. Baunack finds the fifteenth in the eighth person in the list of *χορευταὶ κωμικοί* at the end of the catalogue, since the other lists give only seven performers under this category. There are several serious objections to this explanation. In the first place, the comic choreutes, Thyrsus, whom he would place among the *παῖδες χορευταί*, is a comic *διδάσκαλος* two years later, as we have seen, and a trainer of choruses is not likely to have been among the boy dancers so recently.¹ In the second place, Andron, whom he would transfer from among the *αὐληταί* to a place among the *παῖδες χορευταί*, is clearly an *αὐλητής* two years later (2566, 15). Socrates, the first of the three *αὐληταί*, is known from other sources as a flute-player.² If then we are to reduce the three *αὐληταί* to two, it must be by removing the person between Socrates and Andron to the chorus of boys, viz., *Νικαίας Νικάδα Ἀρκάς*, a person not known elsewhere. The error would have been as easy to commit as that which Baunack assumes, but its consequences were much more serious. The eye of the engraver passed from *Σωκράτης*, the first name under *αὐληταί*, to *Νικαίας*, the second name under another heading — *χοροὶ παίδων*. It then went back

¹ The larger number of comic choreutae here is not, I think, a sufficient reason for suspecting an error. There was no especial reason for holding to the number seven, as there was for having fifteen in the lyric chorus.

² *C.I.A.* II. 1295: *Σωκράτης Ῥόδιος ἤλει*, and a Miletus inscription, *Revue Archeolog.* XXVIII. (1874), p. 108: *αὐλητής, Σ. Ζωχάριος Ἀθηναῖος*. He had meantime obtained Athenian citizenship. Cf. Brinck, p. 215.

to "Ἀνδρῶν, who now wrongly appears as the third aulete instead of second. At this point I believe that the engraver committed another error, due in part to the previous one; he omitted the heading διδάσκαλος and the single name with it and began on the χοροὶ παίδων. Reaching the name of Νικαίας again, he skipped it, naturally, and the next name after it. The matter is not so complicated as the description of the process might lead one to think. Anticipating the discussion that will make some parts of my explanation clearer, I give here first what may have been the copy in the hands of the stone-cutter and then the list as actually inscribed.

ORIGINAL LIST.

ΑΥΛΗΤΑΙΞΩΚΡΑΤΗΣΞΩΧΑΡΙΔΟΞΡΟΔΙΟΞ
 ΑΝΔΡΩΝΤΟΛΥΞΕΝΟΥΤΕΛΛΗΝΕΥΞ
 ΔΙΔΑΣΚΑΛΟΞΠΡΟΝΟΜΟΞΔΙΟΓΕΙΤΟΝΟΞΒΟΙΩΤΙΟΞ
 ΧΟΡΟΙΤΑΙΔΩΝΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΟΔΩΡΟΞΔΙΩΝΟΞΒΟΙΩΤΙΟΞ
 ΝΙΚΑΙΑΞΝΙΚΑΔΑΡΚΑΞ
 ΒΟΙΞΚΟΞΜΕΝΑΛΚΟΥ
 ΠΟΛΥΚΛΗΞΕΡΟΤΙΟΝΟΞΒΟΙΩΤΙΟΞ

LIST AS INSCRIBED.

ΑΥΛΗΤΑΙΞΩΚΡΑΤΗΣΞΩΧΑΡΙΔΟΞΡΟΔΙΟΞ
 15. ΝΙΚΑΙΑΞΝΙΚΑΔΑΡΚΑΞ
 ΑΝΔΡΩΝΤΟΛΥΞΕΝΟΥΤΕΛΛΗΝΕΥΞ
 ΧΟΡΟΙΤΑΙΔΩΝΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΟΔΩΡΟΞΔΙΩΝΟΞ
 ΒΟΙΩΤΙΟΞ — ΠΟΛΥΚΛΗΞΕΡΟΤΙΩΝΟΞΒΟΙ

The engraver discovered his omissions and added the missing names at the end of the list. This is the belief of Baunack as regards the omitted διδάσκαλος. I think it probably the case also as regards the fifteenth choreutes, inasmuch as Baunack's solution does not seem probable. The last two lines of the inscription, which contain the corrections, form a veritable crux for the interpreter as well as for the epigraphist. It is with great diffidence, therefore, that I venture to propose a new interpretation, which will perhaps seem to have its only justification in the fact that the passage is a desperate one

anyway. After the three *ἱματιομίσθαι* stand these lines, set well out in the margin like the category-headings :

· · · ΙΟΙΞΚΟ · ΜΕΝΑ · ΛΚ · · · ΦΙΤΠΡΟΞΑΥΛΗΞΑΙ
 διδάσκαλος · Πρόνομος Διογείτονος Βοιώτιος.

On the text of the broken line Baunack states that in the lacunae after ΜΕΝΑ and ΛΚ we need not necessarily suppose that letters were ever engraved, for the stone may have been originally broken there. He assures us that the next letter is F and not E. As regards the interpretation, he points out that, if two *διδάσκαλοι* were to be added, it is strange that the heading is in the singular and placed in the last line before the one name. We must therefore conclude that only one *διδάσκαλος αὐλητῶν* was employed this year, as in the next,¹ to train the two choruses. Granting this, we should look for the missing choreutes in the mutilated line. Here we are confronted by serious difficulties. The infinitive *προσαυλῆσαι* demands a finite verb on which to depend ; but there are no traces of such a verb nor room for it. Again, the letters FI are impossible as part of the preceding name, even if we should assume an error for EI. Baunack makes the suggestion, only to reject it, that *Μενάλκει* may be an epichoric nominative. Even if we could find a construction for it, the verb *προσαυλῆσαι* would make no conceivable sense here. It is clear that the stone-cutter made a mistake somewhere in the line, and that it is the presence of this undetected error in our text which has hitherto stood in the way of our understanding. We must attack the problem in a different way if we would solve it.

It is the infinitive *προσαυλῆσαι* which causes the greatest grammatical difficulty and is hardest to interpret. We may assume, provisionally, that the corruption lies here. Since

¹ There are three *ποιηταὶ προσοδίων*, then one name after the heading *αὐληταί*, then the two choruses, followed by *διδάσκαλος* and a single name. Baunack would get a second *αὐλητής* from the *ποιηταὶ προσοδίων*. At the end of the inscription a name is added with the heading *αὐλητής*. Baunack sees here a second *διδάσκαλος*. But the singular in the heading *διδάσκαλος* is against this. Besides, would one who had served in the higher capacity of *διδάσκαλος αὐλητῶν* be designated in an *addendum* simply as *αὐλητής* ? There is really no reason why there should not have been three *ποιηταὶ προσοδίων*.

we have formerly assumed that F1 is wrong without finding a solution, let us now assume that it is right. If right, it can only be the numeral sign for 16. In the lacuna before it could then be restored the ending *ου*. This gives us *.]οὔσκο[ς]* *Μενάλκ[ου]* preceded by two letters and followed by two letters—the numeral—then, after the enigmatical *προσανλησαι*, another name. Since no name suggests itself which will suitably fill the space, we may assume another numeral before *.]οὔσκο[ς]*. Now what meaning could numerals have in such a context—names which had been omitted from the preceding list? No conceivable meaning except as references to the lines of the list after which the added names were to be supplied. Now line 16 contains the name of Andron, the last of the *αὔληται*. It was precisely after his name that we should have expected to find the omitted category of *διδάσκαλοι αὔλητῶν*.¹ In the next line, after the reference F1, we find the omitted heading and the name of a well-known *διδάσκαλος αὔλητῶν*, Pronomus.² The word *διδάσκαλος* without the addition of *αὔλητῶν*, which is given in 2566, 17, is somewhat vague, and might refer to the tragic or comic *διδάσκαλοι*. Ordinarily simply *διδάσκαλοι* is used in the captions; but it is clearly defined by its juxtaposition to the *αὔληται* or to the choruses of men and boys. It was to remove all ambiguity, we may believe, that the scrupulous but careless engraver inserted between the numeral and the title the troublesome *προσανλησαι*, in which we can see only *πρὸς αὔλη(τ)αῖ[ς]*. The numeral preceding the name of the choreutes would be E1, if my hypothesis is correct that the omitted name stood after *Νικαίας* on the original copy. The reconstructed passage would accordingly run as follows:

[εἰ· Β]οὔσκος Μενάλκ[ου]· ρί· πρὸς αὔλη(τ)αῖ[ς],
διδάσκαλος· Πρόνομος Διογέιτονος Βοιώτιος.

I am not unaware that this hypothesis is open to grave objections. In the first place it imputes to the stone-cutter

¹ Found after the *αὔληται* in 2563 and 2566. In 2564 the two categories are separated by the choruses.

² *C.I.A.* II. 1292: *Θέων Θηβαῖος ἤλκει | Πρόνομος Θηβαῖος ἐδίδασκε*. The identification is due to Reisch, *De mus. certam*. p. 97.

an altogether unique and modern method. By using another line he could have accomplished the same results by attaching to the names the full title of the class to which they belonged, as is done in the next catalogue. Again the correction of *αυλησαι* to *αὐλη(τ)αῖ[ς]* is violent. On the other hand the use of numerals to mark successive paragraphs is familiar from the Locrian inscription, *I.G.A.* 321,¹ and the reversal of the usual order of the large and small digits is not uncommon,² and should occasion no surprise here. Is the passage as restored more strange than the original, which cannot be read at all, and is the correction as violent as the interpretations that have been proposed for the uncorrected passage? If the editors had found *πρὸς αὐληταῖς* on the stone, I fancy that this inscription would now be cited in the hand-books as furnishing an interesting example of the ancient use of the foot-note.

Before leaving the Soteric inscriptions I desire to call attention to a fact, the significance of which seems to have been overlooked in the many discussions on the subject of the chorus in the New Comedy to which these inscriptions have given rise. I refer to the absence of didascali after the lists of comic choreutae. The comic actors are arranged in groups of three, each group having its own flute-player and didascalus. Then follow the seven (in one case eight) comic choreutae, but without didascalus and flute-player. So in the Soteric catalogue of the second half of the second century (Baunack, 2569—four comic choreutae). The opinions of scholars have varied widely as to the function of these choruses. Wescher and Foucart³ concluded that plays from the Old Comedy were reproduced, but this view has found no acceptance in recent years. The current view to-day seems still to be that of Lüders, who says⁴ that these

¹ The *ρ* is found *ibid.* l. 29.

² Reinach, *Traité d'Épigraphie Grecque*, p. 222; Larfeld in Müller's *Handbücher*, Vol. I., p. 547.

³ *Insc. de Delph.*, p. 11; Foucart, *De colleg. scen. artif.*, p. 75.

⁴ *Dionys. Kunst.*, p. 117 f., Berlin, 1873. See also Müller, *Bühnenalt.*, p. 341 ff. Reisch, in the Pauly-Wissowa *Encyc.*, s.v. "Chor," thinks that "die Beziehung

choreutae "sind nicht dazu bestimmt gewesen, einen eigentlichen Chor zu bilden, sondern sind für Tänzer zu halten, die vielleicht in den Pausen durch pantomimische Tänze etwa mit musicalischer Begleitung das Publicum unterhielten oder auch Lücken in der Handlung auszufüllen bestimmt waren." In formulating this opinion Lüders was evidently proceeding upon the assumption that the regular chorus in comedy had practically disappeared early in the fourth century, and was desirous of interpreting the phenomenon of the third century (second, as he believed) in harmony with what passed as a well-grounded fact.

The belief is rapidly gaining ground, as it seems, that the disappearance of the chorus from comedy was not accomplished until the period of the New Comedy. I need not cite the evidence here,¹ but will show only how the Soteric lists, rightly interpreted, give indications that the connection of the chorus with the performance of the comic actors was organic. In the accounts of the Delian *ἱεροποιοί* (*B.C.H.* XIV (1890), p. 396) is an item which Körte first placed in the right light: *χορῶ τῷ γενομένῳ τοῖς κωμφοδοῖς καὶ τῷ τραγῳδῷ Δράκοντι, τοῖς ἐπιδειξαμένοις τῷ θεῷ, δάδας κτέ.* This Dracon is one of the *τραγῳδοί* at Delos in 281 B.C. and also at Delphi in 271. He evidently was in charge of chorus as well as actors in the tragic contest. It is entirely in line with this bit of evidence that we always find the comic choreutae at Delphi just after the comic actors and without either flute-player or didascalus. Now a chorus, whether

dieser Choreuten zu den Schauspielerpersonen der einzeln Stücke kann nur sehr locker gewesen sein," though he gives no reason for this conclusion.

¹ See my article, "The Chorus in the later Greek Drama," *Am. Jour. Arch.*, Old Series X. (1895), p. 287 ff., Reisch in Dörpfeld-Reisch, *Das Griech. Theater*, p. 257 ff., and A. Körte, *N. Jahrb. f. d. klass. Alterthum* III. (1900), p. 6 ff. Körte's admirable discussion does not dispose of the statement of Schol. Arist. *Ran.* 404, which has caused most of the trouble: *καθάπαξ περιεῖλε Κινησίας τὰς χορηγίας*. It seems unquestionably to be due to a misinterpretation of Strato's allusion to the miserable choral poet Cinesias as *χοροκτόνος*. See my article, p. 316 ff. A passage in Plutarch *Alex.* 29, which distinctly speaks of tragic choruses in Alexander's time, has been generally overlooked: *θυσίας τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ πομπὰς ἐπέτελλει* (i.e. Alexander) *καὶ χορῶν κυκλίων καὶ τραγικῶν ἀγῶνας ὁ μόνον ταῖς παρασκευαῖς ἀλλὰ καὶ ταῖς ἀμίλλαις λαμπροὺς γενομένους*.

designed to fill up pauses in the action of a drama or for any other purpose, could not possibly dispense with the trainer and musician. These catalogues give all of the performers. The conclusion is irresistible that the chorus was under the direction of the didascalus who trained the actors and that its part in the comic performance was an essential part. It is interesting to see in the catalogue of 140-100 B.C. that the choreutae are no longer designated as *κωμικοί*, but as *χορευταὶ κωμῳδοῦ*, *i.e.* are considered as belonging to the single *κωμῳδός* who took part in this exhibition.

Miscellaneous.

I may add here a few comments of a miscellaneous character on some obscure persons met with in the agonistic literature.

Athenaeus, 14,620 d, says: *Ἰάσων δ' ἐν τρίτῳ περὶ τῶν Ἀλεξάνδρου Ἱερῶν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ φησὶν ἐν τῷ μεγάλῳ θεάτρῳ ὑποκρίνασθαι Ἡγησίαν τὸν κωμῳδὸν τὰ Ἡσιόδου, Ἑρμόφαντον δὲ τὰ Ὀμήρου.* We do not know to what occasion Jason refers, but it was probably some celebration in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus. No comic actor by the name of Hegesias is known.¹ We are not informed whether the other actor, Hermophantus, was tragic or comic, but the context would perhaps rather favor the latter supposition. An actor Hermophantus, uncertain whether comic or tragic, is found on a choregic inscription shown by Brinck (*op. cit.* p. 207 ff.) to be from Samos (*C.I.G.* 3091). Boeckh judged by the forms of the letters that the stone was engraved "inter Alexandrum M. fere et primum ante Christum saeculum," but he suggests that an *αὐλητής*, *Σάτυρος*, therein mentioned, is identical with the flute-player *Σάτυρος Σάμιος*, priest of the Teian guild of *τεχνῖται* ca. 170 B.C. (*C.I.G.* 3068), and so inclines to place the former inscription in the same period. But since neither the father's name nor the ethnicon is given there, there is slight basis for this dating. But another Samian flute-player named Satyrus

¹ The son of an Hegesias was comic actor at Delphi in 272 B.C. (Baun. 2563, 68) — [] *Ἡγησίου Ἀθηναῖος.*

has now come to light in the exceptionally interesting Delphic inscription published by Couve in *B.C.H.* XVIII. p. 85: the usual honors are voted to Σάτυρος Εὐμένου Σάμιος because τούτῳ πρώτῳ συμβέβηκεν μόνῳ ἄνευ ἀνταγωνιστῶν αὐλῆσαι τὸν ἀγῶνα καὶ ἀξιωθέντα ἐπιδοῦναι τῷ θεῷ καὶ τοῖς Ἑλλήσι μετὰ τὸν γυμνικὸν τῇ θυσίᾳ ἐν τῷ σταδίῳ τῷ Πυθίῳ αἶσμα μετὰ χοροῦ Διόνυσον καὶ κιθάρισμα ἐκ Βακχῶν Εὐριπίδου. It is sufficiently clear that Satyrus¹ was an aulete (αὐλῆσαι), and since the inscription may go back into the third century the identification with the aulete in the Samian inscription is at least as possible as the other identification suggested by Boeckh. The actor Hermophantus, mentioned by Athenaeus, probably of the third century, may then be the actor in the Samian inscription. This result finds some support from the Athenian list of comic actors victorious at the Lenaea, *C.I.A.* II. 977 uv, col. II. l. 17, where stands the broken name Ἑρμ - - -. The position of this name relative to that of persons in the list whose period of activity is known would bring the first victory of Ἑρμ - - - to about 260-250 B.C. This person is doubtless the actor in Athenaeus, and the word κωμφοῖς can be restored in the Samian inscription, which would accordingly run as follows (adopting Brinck's arrangement): [ἐχορήχουν κωμφοῖς | Ἀριστόδημος . . . ,] | Διόφαντος Διομ . . . , | Βλήσιος Θ. . . . | ἐνίκᾳ Ἀριστόδημος, | ὑποκριτῆς Ἑρμόφαντος.

Theophrastus, in his treatise περὶ γελοίου (Athenaeus, 6, 348 a), relates that Stratonicus, the famous citharode and wit, parodied the proverb μέγας οὐδεὶς σαπρὸς ἰχθύς so that it applied to Σιμύκαν τὸν ὑποκριτήν. In his critical note to the passage in Athenaeus Kaibel refers for the name to Demosthenes *De Cor.* 262, where the orator speaks of Σιμύλος, the tragic actor. It is much more probable that the butt of Stratonicus' jest was the comic actor Σίμακος Μενεκράτου Ἀργεῖος, who performed at the Soteria twice (Baun. 2564, 68, and 2565, 70). A son of this Simacus was a tragic didascalus in 272 B.C. (Baun. 2563, 36). It is therefore probable that

¹ The same person was granted a crown by the Delians, *B.C.H.* XIII. (1889), p. 370, as Couve points out.

Simacus was active in the early part of the century. Now Stratonicus was put to death by Nicocles, the Cyprian king (Ath. 6, 352 d), who died in the reign of the first Ptolemy. The proposed identification is consequently possible chronologically. The form Σιμούκας in Athenaeus is objectionable in itself. It does not occur again and is not in accordance with the rules of Greek name-formation. Σίμακος is found a number of times on inscriptions and is a correct Kosename from some compound of Σίμος. See Fick-Bechtel, p. 251.

The agonistic inscription from Samos, which Mr. Percy Gardner published from a squeeze (*Jour. Hel. Stud.* VII. (1886), 147 ff.; Michel, No. 901), should be inspected again. Gardner's αὐλῶν [σα]τ[ύ]ραν in l. 7, which Michel adopts, seems quite impossible. In l. 6 Gardner restores: [αὐλη]τῆς · Νειλεὺς Ἀμμωνίου, α[ὐλωιδ]ὸς Κιθαριστίων. But the name Κιθαριστίων is unheard of, and in an agonistic inscription it would be better to restore: Νειλεὺς Ἀμμωνίου Ἀ[θηναί]ος κιθαριστ(ῆς) · Ἰων, κτέ. An Athenian appears as a comic poet below. Since this correction satisfactorily disposes of the αὐλωιδός in l. 6, we may suggest in l. 7, for Gardner's αὐλῶν [σα]τ[ύ]ραν, αὐλωι[δός ·] Τ[ύ]ραν[νος - - -] Χησιεύς, the N which Gardner saw on the squeeze being probably the somewhat obscure remains of ΙΔ. Gardner interprets τοὺς ἀπὸ πρώτων in l. 4 [τῇ λα]μπάδι τοῦ Ἡφαίστου τοὺς ἀπὸ πρώτων · Λεωνίδης, as meaning "the victor in the first day's torch-race," supplying some word like λαμπαδιστῶν after πρώτων. But a much easier interpretation suggests itself when we compare e.g. *C.I.A.* II. 444, 71 παῖδας ἐκ πάντων, in connection with such phrases as τῆς πρώτης ἡλικίας, τῆς δευτέρας, τρίτης, τοὺς ἐφήβους, etc. Δημήτριος Νικάρχ[ου], the ὑποκριτῆς παλαιᾶς τραγῳδίας in l. 3, is presumably the same person as the actor in new tragedy, Δημήτριος Νικαίου Μιλήσιος, in l. 9. If this is so, the latter reading is the correct one. It would be easy to mistake the upper portions of ΙΟΥ for ΠΧ.

One would like to know at least the name of the tragic actor who won so many victories at various important festivals in Greece with plays of Euripides, Chaeremon, and Arcestratus, and set up a stone recording his achievements

at Tegea, doubtless his native city. But unfortunately his name is no longer preserved on the stone, which has been published by Bérard in *B.C.H.* XVII. (1893), 15 ff., and Dittenberger, *Sylloge*, ed. 2, No. 700 (see also Vysoky in *Philologus*, LVIII. (1899), 498 ff.). Among the festivals mentioned is the Soteria at Delphi. This actor therefore lived after 276, the date of the first celebration of the Soteria, and the lettering of the inscription will not permit a date beyond the limits of the third century (Dittenberger).¹ Arcadia produced very few actors. Only two tragic actors from there are known, and one of these is of the next century. The other, Ἀπολλογένης Ὀρθαγόρα Ἀρκάς, who performed at Delphi in 271 B.C., may therefore possibly be the Tegeatan actor who set up this dedication.

CORRECTIONS AND RESTORATIONS PROPOSED.

- | | |
|---|---|
| Delian insc., <i>B.C.H.</i> VII. p. 107, l. 16 : Διό[φαντος], p. 124. | Delphic insc., Baunack, no. 2563, l. 31 : [Ὀν]ήσιππος, p. 125. |
| Delian insc., <i>B.C.H.</i> VII. p. 107, l. 20 : [Δ](ρ)ά[κων], p. 117. | Delphic insc., Baunack, no. 2563, l. 32 : [Οί]κιάδης, p. 125. |
| Delian insc., <i>B.C.H.</i> VII. p. 107, l. 22 : (δ)ρ[χηστῆς], p. 120. | Delphic insc., Baunack, no. 2564, l. 80 : Νίκων (Μενεκλέους Σολεύς), p. 127. |
| Delian insc., <i>B.C.H.</i> VII. p. 107, l. 23 : [κωμωιδοποιοί], p. 123. | Delphic insc., Baunack, no. 2564, l. 82 : [εἰ · Β]οῖσκος Μενάλλκ[ου]. <i>φί · πρὸς</i> <i>αὐλ(τ)αί[ς]</i> , p. 131. |
| Delian insc., <i>B.C.H.</i> VII. p. 108, l. 23 : (- -) before Ἀθηναῖος, p. 120, note. | Attic insc., <i>C.I.A.</i> II. 977 uv, col. ii, l. 17 : Ἐρμ[όφαντος], p. 135. |
| Delian insc., <i>B.C.H.</i> VII. p. 110, l. 32 : Ἱερών(υμ)ος, p. 119. | Attic insc., <i>C.I.A.</i> II. 975 e : [Πολύ- ξ]ενος, p. 123. |
| Delian insc., <i>B.C.H.</i> VII. p. 114, l. 21 : Σωτῶν Ἀκαρν[άν](δ)ίς, Παράμονο[s] Χαλκι[δεύς], p. 119. | Samian insc., <i>C.I.G.</i> 3091, before l. 1 : [ἐχορήγουν κωμωιδούς], p. 135. |
| Delian insc., <i>B.C.H.</i> VII. p. 120, l. 9 : Θα[ρ]σύν[ων], p. 122. | Samian insc., <i>J.H.S.</i> VII. p. 148, l. 3 : Δημήτριος Νικα(ίου), p. 136. |
| Delian insc., <i>B.C.H.</i> VII. p. 120, l. 10 : [κιθ]αρ(ω)ῖδοι, p. 122. | Samian insc., <i>J.H.S.</i> VII. p. 148, l. 6 : Ἀ[θηναῖο]ς, καθαριστ[ῆς]· Ἴων, p. 136. |
| Delian insc., <i>B.C.H.</i> VII. p. 120, l. 11 : [κιθ]αρισ[ταί], p. 122. | Samian insc., <i>J.H.S.</i> VII. p. 148, l. 7 : αὐλω(ιδ)[ός]· Τ[ύ]ραν[νος], p. 136. |
| Delian insc., <i>B.C.H.</i> VII. p. 120, l. 13 : [βρωμα]ιστής, p. 122. | Athenaeus 6, 348 a : read Σιμακον for Σιμόκαν, p. 135. |
| Delian insc., <i>B.C.H.</i> IX. p. 149, l. 20 : αὐ[λωι]δός, p. 121. | |

¹ Vysoky, *loc. cit.* p. 500, says : Bedeutend jünger (*i.e.* than the middle of the third century) wird sie allenfalls nicht sein.